



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,525	11/13/2001	Jonathan S. Goldick	MS1711.1/40062.123US01	8013
27488 7590 02/08/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER BOUTAH, ALINA A	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE 3 MONTHS			MAIL DATE 02/08/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/992,525

Applicant(s)

GOLDICK, JONATHAN S.

Examiner

Alina N Boutah

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed October 10, 2006. Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on January 5, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,510,478 issued to Jeffords et al. (hereinafter referred to as Jeffords) in view of USPN 6,704,767 issued to Simmons et al. (hereinafter referred to as Simmons).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 1, Jeffords teaches a method of modifying properties of a lock object associated with a resource in a distributed environment, wherein the lock object has a lock owner, the method comprising:

receiving a request to modify the lock, wherein the request originates from a requesting client computer system (abstract; figure 5, 502);

analyzing the request to determine whether the request is made by the lock owner (figure 5, 504; ; col. 2, lines 55-65); and

if the request is made by the lock owner, modifying the lock (abstract, figure 5; col. 2, lines 41-42; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 18).

However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property associated with lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 2, Jeffords teaches the method as defined in claim 1 wherein the method further comprises:

Art Unit: 2143

following the determination of whether the request is made by the lock owner, determining whether the resource is locked by another client computer system that may conflict with the requested modification (abstract; figure 5); and

if the resource is locked by a conflicting lock, denying the received request (col. 2, line 45-47).

Regarding claim 3, Jeffords fails to explicitly teach a method as defined in claim 1 wherein the request relates to modifying the lock type property type of the lock object. Simmons teaches modifying a lock property type of the lock object (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 4, Jeffords does not teach a method as defined in claim 1 wherein the request relates to the modification of the lock scope property of the lock object. Simmons teaches modifying a lock property of the lock object (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 5, Jeffords teaches a method as defined in claim 1 wherein the request relates to the modification of a lock ownership (abstract, figure 5; col. 2, lines 41-42).

Regarding claim 6, Jeffords teaches a computer program product readable by a computer and encoding instructions for executing the method recited in claim 1 (claim 34).

Regarding claim 7, Jeffords teaches a computer program product readable by a computer and encoding instructions for executing the method recited in claim 5 (claim 34).

Regarding claim 8, Jeffords teaches a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a locked resource, wherein the locked resource comprises:

a resource object data section for storing actual object data (abstract; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 18);

a lock object, wherein the lock object comprises a plurality of properties, wherein a first property identifies a lock owner, and wherein the properties may be modified by the lock owner (abstract; figures 5-10; col. 2, lines 35-62).

However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property associated with lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping

Art Unit: 2143

modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 9, Jeffords teaches a computer-readable medium as defined in claim 8 wherein a second property relates the resource object and wherein the second property may be modified by the lock owner to associate the lock object with a second resource object (col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 18).

Regarding claim 10, Jeffords teaches a computer-readable medium as defined in claim 8 wherein the lock owner may modify the first property relating to lock ownership to transfer the lock object to a second owner (figure 5).

Regarding claim 11, Jeffords teaches a system for modifying a lock object in a distributed environment, the distributed environment having a plurality of resources and wherein at least one resource is associated with the lock object, the system comprising:

a receive module for receiving a resource request from a requesting process, wherein the request includes modification information (abstract; figure 5, 502);

a determination module for determining whether the requesting process owns the lock object associated with the resource (figure 5, 504; col. 2, lines 55-65); and

an update module for modifying the lock object upon a determination that the requesting process owns the lock object (abstract, figure 5; col. 2, lines 41-42; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line

Art Unit: 2143

18), wherein modifying the at least one property occurs without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object.

However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property associated with lock object without unlocking the resource associated with the lock object (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 12, Jeffords teaches a system as defined in claim 11 wherein the determination module also determines whether there is a conflicting lock associated with the requested resource and wherein the update module does not modify the lock object upon a determination that a conflicting lock exists (col. 2, line 45-47). However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 13, Jeffords teaches a system as defined in claim 11 wherein the lock object has a lock type property, and wherein the update module modifies the lock type property (figure 3). However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 14, Jeffords teaches a system as defined in claim 12 wherein the lock object has a lock scope property, and wherein the update module modifies the lock scope property (col. 4, lines 41-65). However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 15, Jeffords teaches a system as defined in claim 11 wherein the lock object has a lock ownership property, and wherein the update module modifies the lock

Art Unit: 2143

ownership property to thereby transfer the lock object from one process to another (figure 9; col. 9, lines 17-41). However, Jeffords does not explicitly teach modifying at least one property associated with the lock. In an analogous art, Simmons teaches modifying a lock property (figure 5; col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 4).

At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated enable modification of lock properties in order to guard against overlapping modifications between concurrent users, thus decrease the likelihood that data will be in incomprehensible state (abstract).

Regarding claim 16, Jeffords teaches a system as defined in claim 11 further comprising a transfer module for transferring ownership of the lock object from the requesting process to another process (figure 9; col. 9, lines 17-41).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeffords in view of Simmons, in further view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 17, Jeffords fails to explicitly teach a system as defined in claim 11 wherein the requesting process communicates with the receive module using Web Distributed Authoring and Versioning protocol. Applicant's admitted prior art teaches a requesting process communicating with received modules using Web Distributed Authoring and Versioning protocol (specification, page 2). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to enable the requesting process to communicate with the receive

Art Unit: 2143

module using Web Distributed Authoring and Versioning Protocol (WebDAV) in order to allow client computer systems to access server-side resources for the purpose of editing those resources.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N. Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANB

ANB


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100